

THE Dan Smoot Report

Vol. 4, No. 8

Monday, February 24, 1958

Dallas, Texas



DAN SMOOT

The Dignity of Man

Robert E. Baskin, Staff writer for the *Dallas Morning News*, has been in New York writing articles on delinquency among school children.

On February 16, 1958, Mr. Baskin told of making the rounds in Manhattan with Morris Kaufman, a truant officer for the New York Public Schools:

"Kaufman's first place of call was a 4-story red-brick building.

"Inside, there was little light. The walls of the first-floor hall were dirty and peeling.

"It took a great deal of door-knocking to arouse the caretaker, who turned out to be a bristling-haired negro man who appeared to be preparing his breakfast.

"Did he know the family? After some thought, he said he believed they were on the fourth floor.

"Then, the long trudge up the iron stairs, our progress noted from time to time by occupants peering from barely opened doors.

"Finally, the door was found and Kaufman rapped authoritatively on it. A short, dark man appeared, wearing heavy woolen pajamas.

"Kaufman, who speaks six languages, tried them all in vain. But it was possible to establish that the family was Greek, and the man did not know where his truant 13-year-old daughter was. . . .

"The next apartment building was much the same. On the third floor lived a Puerto Rican family. Inside was . . . an elderly woman and a small red cheeked girl of 3

"Where was the 12-year-old boy who had not been attending school? Kaufman asked the woman in Spanish.

"He was with relatives, the woman said. He could not go to school because he had no clothes. Besides his head hurt. Could clothes be provided for him by the school?

"Kaufman, noting the family's income on his card, explained that they were not eligible for such help. But the boy must be found and returned to school. He was firm about that. . . .

"After the round of visits, Kaufman talked about New York.

" 'We can't put up roadblocks to keep the people from coming here,' he said. 'But when they get here, we must do all we can to see that they get an education and other opportunities. There is the dignity of man to remember.' "

"This phrase is one that is heard frequently in talking to school and social workers here.

"To maintain the dignity of man, New York pays out millions annually in welfare funds. There is no residence requirement, and a family arriving fresh from Puerto Rico can immediately obtain these payments — rent, groceries, pocket money.

"Kaufman is an educated man. . . . He turned the talk to Texas. He had read Edna Ferber's *Giant* and had found it an interesting study of social conditions there.

THE DAN SMOOT REPORT, edited and published weekly by Dan Smoot, mailing address P. O. Box 1305, Dallas, Texas, Telephone DAvis 8-2464 (Office Address, 1032-A Knob Oak). Subscription rates: \$10.00 a year, \$6.00 for 6 months, \$3.00 for 3 months, \$18.00 for two years. For first class mail \$12.00 a year; by air-mail (including APO and FPO) \$14.00 a year. Reprints of specific issues: 1 copy for 25¢; 6 for \$1.00; 50 for \$5.50; 100 for \$10.00 — each price for bulk mailing to one person.

Copyright by Dan Smoot. Second class mail privileges authorized at Dallas, Texas

"Why, he asked, did the state not do something about the King Ranch? What about the plight of the Mexicans in Texas?"

There in New York we are seeing what the Dignity of Man means in the welfare state which we have built in this once free land. It means going on relief, abandoning all sense of individual responsibility, accepting the philosophy which politicians have exploited to get votes — namely, that America is the promised land where society has the responsibility of feeding, clothing, housing, educating, and entertaining you, and where you have no responsibility except to take all you can get, always demanding more and joining with your fellow relievers to vote en masse for the political party which promises the biggest handouts.

America was once the promised land for men who wanted to be free. They came from all over the earth, impoverished and illiterate; but they helped to build a proud and prosperous civilization, because they did not come here looking for handouts: they came looking for freedom to build, and to become whatever thing their manhood, their faith, and their vision could combine to make them.

One of the freedoms they found in America was the freedom to starve. That is an essential freedom, because freedom is indivisible. If one man has the freedom to work hard and practice thrift and self-discipline and prepare for a comfortable old age, another man must have the freedom to live the life of a wastrel and die in poverty.

When you lay a compulsory tax on the industrious man to support the idler and wastrel, you cut the taproots which nourish a strong society; and your nation begins to decline and fall, just as surely as a tree begins to wither and die when its taproot is severed.

Suppose a teacher in a classroom graded her students in the same way that government tax collectors grade the efforts of all adults in our society.

A teacher gives a test. The actual grades which students make on that test range from 10 to 99.

Why do some students make 99 while others make 10? There are many reasons. Some students are brighter than others. Some students have physical and emotional handicaps that others do not have. And some students just work harder than others.

Suppose that the teacher decides to play God — to eliminate the natural and acquired differences between her students so that they will all receive about the same rewards. She deducts grade points from the top ten per cent of her students — grade points which the top students don't "need," mind you, because they have more than enough for a passing mark — and she redistributes those grade points to the lowest thirty percent of her students, so that everyone in the class will have at least a passing mark.

What effect would that teacher's leveling have on the children? They would all quit trying. Would that help the "unfortunate" lower third of the class? Certainly not: it would hurt them. It would remove all incentive for them to make the best of what they have. And it would ruin the best students, because it would prove that there is no reward for ability or special effort. Why should one student spend his afternoons studying and trying while his friends are hanging out on street corners or watching television — if they are all going to get about the same marks on their report cards?

Why should one man work hard and save his money and try to prepare for his own fu-

ture, if government taxes those who do something for the support of those who do nothing, so that all men, industrious and loafers alike, will spend their twilight years on about the same kind of pension, regardless of how they have spent or wasted their lives?

Return to the classroom analogy: how can the teacher best help those "unfortunate" students who are lazy or handicapped?

One of the finest things she can do for them is to treat them with the respect that a free human being deserves: to let them know that she does not regard them as charity students or weaklings—that she is not going to take something away from someone else in order to give them something they have not earned. Let them know that God created man to live in a world where he must earn his living by the sweat of his brow. Let them know that they cannot expect something for nothing. Let them know that if they whimper about their handicap instead of working to overcome it, they will never acquire the "dignity of man" that only proud and self-reliant people can have.

This will sound harsh to people who have never recognized the reality of human existence, namely, that life is harsh. No child was ever created perfect, and no child was ever reared to adulthood in a perfect environment.

Since the time of Adam, every human being who has ever trod the earth has labored under some kind of "handicap." The fortunate ones are those who learn this harsh lesson early in life and who spend their lives in proud determination to do the most with what God has given them.

It may sound inhuman to say that one of the essentials of freedom is the freedom to starve. But think a moment. Before the days

of new-dealism and modern republicanism, before America became a welfare state—in the days when impoverished immigrants came to America knowing full well they would get no government-guaranteed "security" here, knowing they would find here nothing but freedom, freedom to accomplish something or freedom to starve without governmental interference—how many starved? None!

There are more poverty and crime and degeneracy and vicious juvenile delinquency in our great cities today than ever before in our history—after a quarter-of-a-century of the welfare state.

To my knowledge, none of the investigating committees of Congress, or the welfare agencies of government, or the politicians who buy votes from one group of citizens by promising them something to be paid for by another group of citizens, has ever yet publicly told the *truth* about the real cause of the juvenile delinquency (like that currently publicized in New York), which is actually nationwide and which threatens the foundations of our society.

The truth is that the vicious juvenile delinquency of today is one of the fruits of welfare-statism.

We have now a whole generation of Americans who have been taught by official, government propaganda to scorn the old virtues of thrift, hard work, and individual responsibility. We have a whole generation of Americans who have been taught that they do not need to worry about their present conduct or future security, because government has undertaken to run their lives for them. Government will take care of them if they get in trouble. Government will pension them off when they grow

old. Government will assume all responsibility for all individuals — if individuals will just vote for the right politicians.

If you don't believe these broad assertions about government deliberately undermining the sense of individual responsibility which is necessary to a strong and stable free society, reflect on the following editorial which was published in the May 27, 1957, issue of the *Union Leader* (Manchester, New Hampshire) under the title "Top-Level Infiltration!":

The New York *Journal-American* quotes a high Washington official as having "...called saving for the 'rainy day' of old age and 'the cultural beliefs about individual responsibility, hangover ideas of an earlier economic era' which hinder 'the fullest use of social legislation.'"

That statement shows that, at least so far as the author is concerned, the millennium of the Socialist "Welfare State" has arrived! Who made this basically un-American statement? Charles I. Schottland, Commissioner of Social Security of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare since 1954!

We shudder to think how many men like Schottland are entrenched in the Eisenhower administration where, through their words and actions, they contribute to the destruction of our American Republic.

Now, consider again the trip which the *Dallas Morning News* reporter made with Mr. Morris Kaufman, truant officer in Manhattan. How about the Puerto Rican woman whose 12-year-old son was not in school because he did not have clothes? She obviously had enough money to buy clothes for the boy. Mr. Kaufman, who believes in welfare statism, noted that her family income was so high that she was not entitled to the kind of charity she wanted.

Did this Puerto Rican woman come to the United States because she wanted freedom and opportunity? Obviously not. She came because she had heard that New York is a place where you can get everything you need, for nothing.

If we continue building a welfare state which attracts to our shores the drones and

dregs of society from all over the earth, and which penalizes the thrifty and industrious among us for the purpose of feeding, clothing, housing, educating, and providing pocket money for the shiftless and the irresponsible, we will continue to spawn millions of delinquents, both adult and juvenile.

When the delinquents outnumber the law-abiding, when the proud and industrious can no longer carry the impossible burden, and when law and order finally break down, our people will do what many people have done before us—welcome any kind of dictatorship in preference to the reigning chaos and anarchy.

Did you realize that many of the nations of eastern Europe, now behind the iron curtain, accepted communist dictatorship as a relief from chaos and anarchy which communists had deliberately created? They did.

* * * * *

Fruits of the Welfare State

Moral decay can be compared to any other human destroyer: fire, flood, or disease.

If not stopped at its source, fire—beginning in an abandoned shack or in the underbrush of a forgotten field—will soon spread to the door of the most carefully tended home in town.

Flood waters, usually starting in the river bottoms, first shatter the unattractive shanties—but soon find their way uptown.

An open sewer, neglected in the slums, will pollute the water supply in fashionable districts.

Rot usually begins in some dark, neglected corner; but if not checked, it spreads until its destruction is total.

So it has always been—so it will always be.

In America, all well-run communities have expensively equipped fire departments; they spend heavily for adequate sewage and drainage; and they wage a continual war against filth that breeds disease.

Yet, oddly enough, the most prosperous communities (the big cities) have actively nourished the worst disease of the twentieth century—the moral decay that is inevitable in a welfare state.

Is juvenile delinquency a disease of the slums?

Some of the worst gangs of juvenile delinquents (in Dallas, Texas, and in all other major cities) are from prosperous homes, in fashionable parts of town.

Twenty-five years of the welfare state—under the labels of new-dealism, fair-dealism, and modern republicanism—have indoctrinated a frightful number of Americans with the notion that they as individuals are not, and cannot be, responsible for their own welfare and behavior.

Parents have given up responsibility for their own children—have passed this responsibility on to the authorities and the experts: to governmental bureaus, to the schools, to the police, to the welfare agencies.

In August, 1956, J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, said:

"Youth under 18 last year committed 42 per cent of the nation's crimes. Half of these were committed by those 15 and younger. . . . I am highly in favor of newspapers publishing the names of juveniles who commit felonies. The more spotlight newspapers can throw on any wrongdoing is a fine thing."

But do the newspapers print the names of young hoodlums?

Not often.

That would tend to place blame and responsibility on parents, and on the delinquent himself. The sickly notion of the welfare state is that individuals—particularly, *young* individuals—should not be blamed or held accountable for their own misdeeds. Wrongdoing is the fault of "society." "Society" must coddle and protect the young delinquents and must refrain from embarrassing them, lest they be scarred and frustrated.

Many a parent in socially acceptable parts of town has become as irresponsible toward his children as the shiftless drunk has always been—because the welfare state has removed the social pressures that are powerful forces for promoting decent behavior.

The newspaper editor who starts printing the names of juvenile delinquents today may realize that tomorrow he could be called upon to name his own son, or the mayor's son, or his best friend's daughter.

When parents are no longer willing to accept the responsibility for training their own children, they are only one step from giving up responsibility for themselves. Many have already done so.

Each year, each month, each day, more families go on relief, although these are relatively prosperous times.

There is no longer any stigma attached to "going on relief." It has become smart to get as much as you can for nothing. There are

many wealthy people who permit their own parents to go on relief—and boast about it.

The bureaucrats who control welfare funds encourage the notion that professional reliefism is honorable: the more people on relief, the more jobs and power for the welfare bureaucrats.

And when bureaucrats are spending money that was taken away from someone else, it is not reasonable to expect them to be cautious and frugal—or even honest—in the spending.

On May 27, 1957, the *Chicago Tribune* started a series of articles on welfare frauds.

The first article began:

"Cheating by state relief recipients, lax administration, and negligence have been uncovered by an investigation by the Tribune of the Illinois Public Aid program. Reporters ... have found cases of relief cheaters writing promissory notes and welshing on them without prosecution, the rejection of fraud complaints from judges and laxity of prosecution of cheats. Cases were found where cheaters continued to draw relief."

Here are two of many cases the *Tribune* discovered:

Mrs. Marie Jackson, mother of 15, lived with her husband at 1048 E. 43rd street, while she was getting \$316.20 a month as aid to dependent children.

Mrs. Jackson defrauded the state of \$17,900 in six years and continued to receive aid for 18 months after she was prosecuted for her fraud. On December 17, 1953, she got a year's probation for the fraud and signed a promissory note for \$17,900. But she was not removed from the relief rolls until June 9, 1955. Relief officials said that a woman can sign such a note and remain on the relief rolls if she can prove that she needs aid.

Rachel Tart, who defrauded the state of \$1,589.13, said she didn't know she was cheat-

ing by accepting money from Albert Butler, father of her children.

Reporters, who called at Mrs. Tart's apartment, found her two children, their clothes tattered and dirty, playing with a whiskey shot glass. Most of the apartment was in disrepair, but there was a television set and a new red telephone in the living room with an extension in the bedroom.

Occasionally—only occasionally—an indigent family does not qualify under a state law for relief. This makes headlines of another kind.

In 1956, Mrs. Martha Winton, negro, 40, who had left her home in Alabama and brought her seven dependent children to Cleveland, Ohio, was denied welfare relief in that city.

Mrs. Winton, who had been separated from her husband for five years, appeared in Judge Albert A. Woldman's court—with her eight dependent children, ranging in age from seventeen years to eleven days. She reported that she had left Alabama (where she had been on relief) because she didn't want her children "to grow up in the south."

In Ohio, only persons who have lived in the state for a year are eligible for relief.

Judge Woldman ruled that Mrs. Winton and her children must return to the relief rolls of Alabama.

The Judge said:

"But I am disturbed when I find a mother, no matter what her station in life, blocked by law in her attempt to improve the lot of herself and her family."

Mrs. Winton's attempt to "improve the lot of herself and her family" was an effort to get them bigger relief checks. Nothing in her rec-

ord indicates that she ever made any other attempt.

The November 22, 1957, issue of the *Los Angeles Examiner* reported that relief applications in that city had increased 40 percent in one year.

In October, 1957, 3,516 people applied for relief, compared to 2,518 in October, 1956. Aid-to-dependent children increased from 1,448 to 1,900 in the same period. According to the director of the bureau of public assistance in Los Angeles, Mr. Leland F. Carter, the applications for unemployment insurance in Long Beach alone went up 10 percent.

All of this during the most "prosperous" period in history!

* * * * *

Why Not Try Freedom?

How does all this ugliness—this discussion of hoodlum kids, irresponsible parents, and social parasites—concern you who are a responsible, conscientious, hard-working, tax-paying citizen?

This ugliness is part of the rot that spreads

decay through a community, a nation, and a people.

If ten percent of the nation's crimes were committed by youngsters under eighteen years of age, perhaps you could shrug it off by saying, it was ever so. But juvenile crimes are now approaching (and may have passed) fifty percent of the national total.

If ten percent of the American people were on some kind of welfare relief, the burden on the remaining ninety percent might not be too heavy. But, at the going rate of increase, how long will it be before fifty percent of this nation's population is on the public dole?

When did it begin? It began when Government started robbing the people of their personal responsibilities—taxing their money away from them in order to manage their lives for them.

The welfare state, created to help the indigent, burdens—and ultimately corrupts—the productive.

Comparatively few people work hard for the pure pleasure of laboring. They work, because they would rather *work* and *have*, than *not work* and *not have*. But the welfare state is changing that.

WHO IS DAN SMOOT?

Dan Smoot was born in Missouri. Reared in Texas, he attended SMU in Dallas, taking BA and MA degrees from that university in 1938 and 1940.

In 1941, he joined the faculty at Harvard as a Teaching Fellow in English, doing graduate work for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in the field of American Civilization.

In 1942, he took leave of absence from Harvard in order to join the FBI. At the close of the war, he stayed in the FBI, rather than return to Harvard.

He served as an FBI Agent in all parts of the nation, handling all kinds of assignments. But for three and a half years, he worked exclusively on communist investigations in the industrial midwest. For two years following that, he was on FBI headquarters staff in Washington, as an Administrative Assistant to J. Edgar Hoover.

After nine and a half years in the FBI, Smoot resigned to help start the Facts Forum movement in Dallas. As the radio and television commentator for Facts Forum, Smoot, for almost four years spoke to a national audience giving both sides of great controversial issues.

In July, 1955, he resigned and started his own independent program, in order to give only one side—the side that uses fundamental American principles as a yardstick for measuring all important issues. Smoot now has no support from, or connections with, any other person or organization. His program is financed entirely from sales of his weekly publication, *The Dan Smoot Report*.

If you believe that Dan Smoot is providing effective tools for those who want to think and talk and write on the side of freedom, you can help immensely by subscribing, and encouraging others to subscribe, to *The Dan Smoot Report*.

In the welfare state, those who work pay the bills for those who don't.

When the list of those who receive grows longer than the list of those who produce, society is in an advanced stage of decay.

Is there a remedy? Of course: adopt the constitutional amendment proposed by Congressman Ralph Gwinn's H.J.R. 355. This would repeal the income tax amendment and compel the federal government to operate within the limits specified by the Constitution.

Take the excess money away from the bureaucrats and they can't provide bread and circuses and pocket money for people who are willing to trade their votes for public doles.

In this connection, it seems to me strange that the southern states have not yet produced a top-ranking statesman to propose a solution for the south's "integration" problem.

Why don't southerners just shut down their welfare states completely—close all tax-supported schools, parks, swimming pools, play-

grounds, museums, and resort hotels? This would take a heavy tax burden off their citizens, leaving them with enough of their own money to provide, by organized private effort, whatever institutions of learning, culture, and recreation they want.

Then, all the people who want benefits that someone else is taxed to provide could leave the south and go to states where welfarism is abundant. Self-reliant people in other states, who are tired of welfarism, could go south where they would be on their own.

Neither the Supreme Court nor the Attorney General nor the 101st Airborne Division could do a thing about it, because the southern states would no longer be dispensing public money on a segregated basis.

If we could get the federal government out of the welfare business, by adopting the proposed Gwinn Amendment; and if one state or one region could find the courage and statesmanship to try freedom, there is little doubt that the loss of productive citizens, and the influx of non-productive citizens, would soon compel all the remaining states or regions to try freedom, too.

If you do not keep a permanent file of *The Dan Smoot Report*, please mail this copy to a friend who is interested in sound government.

DAN SMOOT,
P. O. Box 1305
Dallas, Texas

Please enter my subscription for (_____ years) (_____ months) to THE DAN SMOOT REPORT. I enclose \$_____; please bill me for_____.

Rates: \$10 for 1 year
\$ 6 for six months
\$ 3 for three months
\$12 first class mail
\$14 for air mail
\$18 for 2 years

PRINT NAME

STREET ADDRESS

CITY AND STATE

is
i-
n
t,
d

at
ve
is
s,
h

r-
on
n-
ic

ut
o-
or
s-
bt
he
on
to

--

--